DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 206 SP 037 466

AUTHOR Wraga, William G.
TITLE Historical Perspectives on the 'Reconceptualization' of Curriculum Studies.
PUB DATE 97
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; Educational Theories; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS Kuhn (Thomas S); National Science Foundation; Tyler (Ralph W)

ABSTRACT

A particular historical account of the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field has prevailed since advocates of this movement began promoting it in the late 1970s. The standard account is that two developments have led to the demise of the curriculum field and education reform. First, leaders of national reform excluded curriculum specialists in favor of cognate field specialists under the auspices of the National Science Foundation (NSF) in the 1960s. In the next decade, economic recession, leading to cutbacks, further marginalized the traditional curriculum field. Moreover, "reconceptualists" insist that traditional curriculum was designed to maintain the existing social order. Alternative historical perspectives indicate a commitment to democratic forms of educational leadership and that scientific management practices associated with social control were more influential in the field of education administration. Curriculum history written during the 1960s and 1970s may reflect the prevailing disillusionment with traditional institutions in America at that time. Curriculum histories of this period often tied their critique of the curriculum past to events of the curriculum present, drawing direct connections between the 1920s and 1970s while effectively ignoring the intervening decades. Until reconceptualized curriculum theorists confront the historically problematic assumptions of their theory, the events of the 1970s will be better understood not as a true paradigm shift but as a movement resonating in the prevailing sociopolitical milieu. Contains 93 notes. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. G. Wraga

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 410 206

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE 'RECONCEPTUALIZATION' OF CURRICULUM STUDIES

William G. Wraga

Department of Educational Leadership

University of Georgia

G-10 Aderhold Hall, Athens, GA 30602

Tel.: 706-542-4166

email: wwraga@moe.coe.uga.edu

http://www.coe.uga.edu/leadership/Faculty/wraga

Prepared for Presentation at the Annual Meeting of

the American Educational Research Association

Chicago, IL 28 March 1997

PRESENTATION DRAFT
PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION

SP034466

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

". . . the ability to define the meaning of the past grants the power to define the meaning of the present and the future; . . . people without a historical memory are easily manipulated through myths of the present. To lack a narrative of one's own past, from the personal to the national level, is to fall victim to the pseudohistorical representations of others."[1]

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE 'RECONCEPTUALIZATION' OF CURRICULUM STUDIES

A particular historical account of the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field has prevailed since advocates of this movement began advancing it in the late 1970s. In short, this account holds that during the 1970s the "traditional" technical-bureaucratic approach to curriculum was "moribund," a variety of fresh theoretical perspectives were introduced to the field, and a new "reconceptualized" curriculum field emerged that appropriately refocused scholarly activity from curriculum development to curriculum understanding. In the late 1990s, this account is in danger of becoming a metanarrative that privileges one perspective while delegitamizing others. A new understanding of the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field during the 1970s can be attained by examining it from alternative historical perspectives.

Alternative historical perspectives on the "reconceptualization" can be achieved by first summarizing the standard account of the "reconceptualization" and then revealing the reliance of this account on narrow interpretations and incomplete depiction of the National Science Foundation reforms, the Tyler rationale, the origins of the curriculum field, and Kuhn's concept of paradigmatic change. Once the limitations of the standard account of the "reconceptualization" are exposed, alternative understandings can be attained by considering the "reconceptualization" as a reflection of pervading trends in American social thought, as a manifestation of "interesting social theory," and as an "interpersonal-affiliative phenomenon." Finally, recent efforts to reconcile reconceptualized curriculum theory with the historic field warrant consideration in light of these alternative historical perspectives.

The Standard Account

Available accounts of the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field typically explain it in relation to important events and changing contours of the curriculum field and educational reform. Pinar, et al., for example, initially identified two developments in educational reform that signaled the "demise" of the traditional curriculum field. The first was the exclusion of curriculum specialists from leadership of the national reforms instigated under the auspices of the National Science Foundation (NSF) during the 1960s. They reported that "the national Defense Act funds were not channeled to curriculum specialists."[2] Pinar claimed that this "bypass was a kind of deathblow to a field whose primary justification was its expertise in an area now dominated by cognate-field specialists."[3] Pinar, et al. suggested that, by their exclusion from the NSF projects, traditional curriculum specialists lost credibility and ultimately were marginalized from mainstream curriculum reform.

Pinar, et al. indicated that during the 1970s economic recession led to widespread educational retrenchment and established the conditions for the second development in the demise of the traditional curriculum field. Among the programs to suffer under financial constraints were in-service and curriculum development efforts. As Pinar put it, "A field whose professional status was irreparably damaged now lost the material basis necessary for its functioning."[4] The resources vital to school-based curriculum development gone, traditional curriculum specialists were further removed from practice.

Looking back from the mid-1990s, Pinar, et al. added that these two developments,

> coupled with declining enrollments, politically ascendant departments of educational administration and educational psychology, the replacement of retiring curriculum generalists with subject matter specialists (such as science educators), and the paradigm instability within the field itself (i.e., dissatisfaction over the Tyler rationale), all sent the curriculum field in crisis.[5]

Collectively, these conditions marginalized traditional curriculum specialists from school practice and established favorable conditions for a shift in focus from curriculum development to curriculum understanding. Further, Pinar, et al. characterized the resulting "reconceptualization" as part of the "challenge to conventional ideas of American culture generally," pointing to the "self-critique" of most social science specializations in the university that followed in the wake of the counter-culture movement of the 1960s.[6] As practical curriculum problems became obsolete, theoretical curriculum concerns filled the remaining vacuum and swiftly dominated scholarly activity in the field. By the mid-1980s, Pinar confidently proclaimed the reconceptualization of the curriculum field complete.[7]

Initially, the reconceptualization was preoccupied with "a comprehensive critique of the field as it is, a field immersed in pseudo-practical, technical modes of understanding and action."[8] This critique drew almost exclusively from European sources and denigrated the literature of the American field of curriculum. These sources hailed from "disparate traditions--Marxism, existentialism, phenomenology, psychoanalysis--whose common bond in the context of the curriculum field is their dissimilarity to the behaviourism and empiricism characteristic of American social science and educational research."[9] The critique centered around a narrow interpretation of Tyler's rationale that depicted it as a top-down, technical-bureaucratic form of social engineering that silenced and oppressed the genuine voices of teachers and students. Thus

depicted, Tyler was said to represent virtually the whole of the curriculum field prior to the reconceptualization. Early reconceptualist work sought "to repudiate the limiting instrumentality that they saw dominating curriculum theory and research."[10] As Pinar put it, "To a considerable extent, the reconceptualization is a reaction to what the field has been."[11]

More than a mere reaction, the early critique amounted to a sheer rejection of the traditional field.[12] Central to this rejection was a commitment to distancing curriculum theory from school practice. By the end of the 1970s, "attention shifted from a critique of the Tylerian tradition to reconceptualist themes themselves."[13] During the 1980s and 1990s, political, racial, gender, postmodern, aesthetic, autobiographical, and theological approaches to curriculum theorizing came into their own. Particular emphasis fell on personal curriculum theorizing, which found its quintessential expression in Pinar's notion of currere as autobiographical method.[14]

This account of the origins of the "reconceptualization" is compelling, but problematic. It uncritically accepts the popular criticisms of the school and overstates the significance of the NSF reforms to the curriculum field. Although school critics of the 1950s directed a small amount of their attack at curriculum specialists, in the big picture this attention was incidental. The brunt of critics' assault was aimed at progressive education writ large.[15] Importantly, most of these attacks were premised upon grossly exaggerated "straw men" that served as foils against which the critic's proposals would shine. Wild overgeneralizations characterized attacks upon the schools and upon professional "educationists." The anti-education sentiment manifest in the exclusion of educators from the advisory boards of the post-Sputnik reform

efforts was directed at professional educators at large. To imply that curriculum specialists were the main target of such criticism is to overstate the case.

The discipline-centered NSF curriculum projects represented a repudiation of approved practices in the curriculum field. In their 1995 text Pinar and associates recognized that interdisciplinary curricula, the purposeful connection of the curriculum to the life of the learner, and substantive teacher participation were by the 1950s basic principles of curriculum development.[16] These principles were not employed in the design of the NSF projects; indeed, they were undermined. The demise of the NSF projects can be traced to the failure to operationalize approved practices of the curriculum field like these. The exclusion of curriculum professors from NSF reforms by policymakers can be viewed not as a failure on the part of the former to exert their influence, but as a failure on the part of the latter to exercise sound judgment based upon research and practice in the curriculum field. Paradoxically, approved practices of the curriculum field, discredited by advocates of discipline-centered curricula, were validated by the failure of the NSF projects. By the time this was apparent in the 1970s, curriculum scholarship was largely unconcerned with such practical matters and inadequate attention was brought to this issue. Practical matters of curriculum development were eclipsed by theoretical matters of curriculum understanding.

Overcoming Undesirable Traditions

Advocates of the "reconceptualization" understand it as premised upon a repudiation of the traditional curriculum field.[17] This repudiation rests largely upon Herbert Kliebard's interpretation of Ralph Tyler's Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction and of the early history of the curriculum field.[18]

Kliebard depicted the Tyler rationale as a "production model of curriculum" and as an outgrowth of the early field's preoccupation with social efficiency and social control.[19] Kliebard's writings were cited in key arguments favoring the "reconceptualization" and reprinted in influential anthologies.[20] In early "reconceptualization" literature, Kliebard's interpretations were exalted at the exclusion of others. That a purported paradigm shift depended solely on one of several available historical interpretations, and that other interpretations were not even critiqued, is remarkable in itself.[21] That the chosen interpretation was advanced uncritically is perhaps incredible, especially considering the premium placed upon incisive criticism as a trademark of much reconceptualized curriculum theory.

Tyler as Archetype

Advocates of the "reconceptualization" held up the Tyler rationale as the archetype of the traditional field. Relying heavily on Kliebard's interpretation, they depicted the Tyler rationale as a "linear administrative procedure for curriculum development" designed to maintain the hegemonic existing social order.[22] Kliebard's interpretation of Tyler's rationale went unchallenged until recently. Hlebowitsh and Kliebard engaged in a revealing debate about the meaning of the rationale that is too lengthy to reiterate fully here.[23] Hlebowitsh, for example, indicated that Tyler "noted that the Rationale need not be used in a step-wise or rigidly linear fashion," and quoted Tyler's closing paragraph in the appendix to his article.[24] Kliebard countered that the examples Tyler offered in the closing paragraph of his book all applied to the first question in the Rationale.[25] In fact, Tyler took his examples from the first and fourth questions and included any "concern of the staff" as a starting point, which, obviously,

encompasses all four questions.[26] Further, in discussing the process of selecting educational purposes, Tyler noted, "However, it is true that in any process of development there is value in shuttling back and forth from one step to a preceding and subsequent step in the process."[27] More telling, however, is Tyler's conception of curriculum evaluation and development as a problem-solving process.

Tyler proposed that once evaluation procedures revealed strengths and weaknesses of the educational program of a local school, educators should properly generate possible reasons for the weaknesses in particular. By treating the reasons as hypotheses to be tested in the educational situation, problems relating to the nature or organization of educational experiences provided to students, or even relating to identified purposes, could be resolved. Through this kind of curriculum planning, "it is possible for the curriculum and instructional program to be continuously improved over the years."[28] Tyler's conception of curriculum development as a problem-solving process bears striking resemblance to Dewey's similar notion.[29]

Promoters of the "reconceptualization" also claimed that the Tyler rationale manifests managerial prerogatives that dominated the "traditional" curriculum field. Pinar, et al. maintained that "the functionality of social efficiency asserted itself simply and forcefully in the Tyler Rationale."[30] They stated flatly, "The Tyler procedure is not a teacher's statement of curriculum development, it is a bureaucrat's."[31] Hlebowitsh indicated that, in fact, Tyler generated his rationale in his work with the Eight-Year Study. Here is Tyler's account of the genesis of his curriculum development rationale at a summer

workshop for teachers participating in the Eight-Year Study held at Ohio State University:

> Wilford Aikin, who was the Director of the entire study, interviewed the heads of the schools and they were saying that the evaluation staff was so much more helpful than the curriculum staff. Aikin said, 'That's very funny because they need curriculum help.' McCutchen said, 'It's because Tyler has a rationale for evaluation that made sense to them, and they know how to proceed, but there isn't any rationale for curriculum.' We got this from the morning session.
>
> Then we adjourned for lunch, and I said to Hilda Taba (who was on our staff in social studies--one of the best of my associates), "Shucks, we can produce a rationale for them.' She said, 'You can!' I said, 'Yes,' and on a napkin I sketched out the basics of what later became the Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction; that is, the needs to get data about the society about the students, and all of these things. After lunch I brought that back to them and they said, 'That's just what we need.' But it was just bringing together all the things that had been coming; as we had worked with them, I had seen this need, as the teachers had tended to go different ways because they didn't have a complete picture of the curriculum planning.[32]

Tyler generated his rationale in response to the need of teachers to think about curriculum in unconventional ways that could take them beyond the traditional discipline-centered curriculum. Snyder, Zumwalt, and Bolin identified three approaches to curriculum implementation which represent, in effect, a continuum of autocratic to democratic-participative forms of curriculum development: the fidelity approach; mutual adaptation; and curriculum enactment.[33] They cited the Eight-Year Study as a prime example of curriculum enactment. The Tyler rationale emerged from the most democratic and effective approach to curriculum improvement known to the field. Contrary to what advocates of the "reconceptualization" insist, although the Tyler rationale--indeed, any rationale--certainly can be used in a top-down, autocratic fashion, it was neither designed, nor destined, for such use.

Social Efficiency Thesis

This interpretation of the historic field takes in more than the Tyler rationale, for Tyler was said to represent the priorities of the larger field. Early accounts emphasized that the "reconceptualization" involved a rejection of the bureaucratic, managerial, and technical approach to curriculum that purportedly dominated the curriculum field to that time. Advocates of the "reconceptualization" continue to depict the historic curriculum field as preoccupied with an autocratic, bureaucratic, and narrowly technical prerogatives that oppress teachers and students.[34] Advocates of the "reconceptualization" associate the traditional curriculum field with administrative concern with control and with an unwitting loyalty to the reproduction of the existing social order and all of its injustices and inequities. This perspective on the curriculum field was supported by Kliebard's historical interpretation of the field, specifically that the field was born in an effort to promote social efficiency and social control through the agency of the school.

Kliebard cited 1918 as a fitting starting point of the curriculum field.[35] During that year, Franklin Bobbitt's The Curriculum, the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education's Cardinal Principles report, Alexander Inglis' Principles of Secondary Education, and William Kilpatrick's "The Project Method" were published. Kliebard suggested that while "Inglis' and Kilpatrick's [works] must be regarded essentially as works of individual genius, . . . Bobbitt's and the Cardinal Principles report were distinctive products of their time and their intellectual and social milieu."[36] Kliebard proceeded by associating the origins of the field in the second and third decades of this century exclusively with social efficiency-social control as he claimed were advocated in the works of Bobbitt and the Commission. He suggested that progressive ideas, such as those

evident in the work of Kilpatrick and Inglis, did not emerge until the 1930s in the work of curriculum scholars such as Hollis Caswell and L. Thomas Hopkins. In his early work that informed the reconceptualization, Kliebard stressed the social efficiency elements and de-emphasized the work of the progressive branch of the field.[37]

This interpretation of the early history of the curriculum field is problematic for several reasons. First, both Inglis and Kilpatrick were members of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. Both served along with Chessman Herrick on the reviewing committee that approved the final draft of the Cardinal Principles report.[38] Ideas expressed in the 1918 works of Inglis and Kilpatrick are evident in the Cardinal Principles report. In fact, the main ideas of the Cardinal Principles report and Inglis' Principles of Secondary Education are nearly identical.[39] These facts suggest that the influence of progressive curriculum ideas was greater than Kliebard estimated.

Important work of progressive curriculum professors was well under way during the formative years of the curriculum field. In addition to Dewey's endeavors at the University of Chicago Laboratory School, Junius Meriam's efforts in the laboratory schools of the University of Missouri and Frederick Bonser's work at the experimental Speyer School affiliated with Teachers College, Columbia University laid vital foundations for the progressive curriculum development projects on the secondary level during the thirties.[40] With the exception of Dewey's work, these and other contemporary efforts have received scant attention from curriculum historians.

If the social efficiency-social control branch truly dominated the curriculum field during its formative years, this dominance would likely be

apparent in the famous "composite" statement of the National Soceity for the Study of Education's Committee on Curriculum-Making. The influence of Charters and Bobbitt on the document, however, is apparent but not dominant. Finding the position of none of the four interest groups he articulated pronounced in the document, Kliebard denigrated the statement as "bland." The influence of the social efficiency-social control branch of the field was insufficient to sway other members of the Committee during the hey day of the social efficiency movement.[41]

Furthermore, evidence suggests that scientific management practices associated with Taylor had greater influence on the field of educational administration than on the fields of curriculum or supervision. Callahan and Button, for example, suggested that scientific management practices popular in the field of educational administration enjoyed considerably less influence in the field of supervision because of the important connection of supervision with the improvement of curriculum.[42] Building upon the work of Callahan and Button, Pajak noted that the "field of supervision distinguished itself from administration during the 1930s," instead allying itself with curriculum. This alliance resulted in the marriage of the two fields in the 1943 founding of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. "From 1943 to the early 1960s," Pajak continued, "writers on supervision clarified and elaborated on the concept of democratic educational leadership."[43]

The literature of the curriculum field yeilds a similar commitment to democratic forms of educational leadership and of curriculum development. Bonser, for example, claimed that when developing curriculum, each teacher "should be given the widest possible opportunities to work along lines in which

she feels the greatest interest in and in which she has the most to give. The organization of the work should be thoroughly democratic," he concluded. Relatedly, Bonser asserted that, "The curriculum must grow as a really living thing and the teachers must grow with it, if it is to be effective."[44] The Committee on Curriculum-Making wrote that it "heartily commends the practice of releasing efficient teachers from active class work to participate in the study of the content and organization of the curriculum materials within their chosen fields of work."[45] Caswell and Campbell declared that "every teacher is a curriculum maker." They concluded that, "An effective curriculum program, then, should provide for extensive participation by all teachers and representative lay groups."[46] L. Thomas Hopkins, whose interest in curriculum was inspired by his Harvard teacher, Alexander Inglis, characterized the teacher's role as follows:

> The teacher guides pupils and parents in selecting needs to be studied and in planning well-rounded programs of living. As a guide, he is not one apart who gives directions. He is a participating member of the group, the same as any other person.[47]

This commitment to democratic forms of curriculum development, which first appeared during the height of interest in social efficiency, is absent from accounts of curriculum history discussed above and obscured by the prevailing social efficiency-social control thesis.[48] To contend that the curriculum field simply "began in administrative convenience, not in intellectual necessity" ignores two decades of curriculum work that predated Jesse Newlon's work in Denver. Such a contention also obscures the details of the Denver curriculum develpoment project. Suggesting that the curriculum field emerged as a mere administrative convenience is tantamount to asserting that affirmative action was born in a bureaucratic act.[49]

The neglect of the progressive branch of the curriculum field in prevailing historical accounts is probably due to an apparently calculated overemphasis placed upon the social efficiency branch of the field. In addition to Kliebard, Apple and Franklin concentrated on the social efficiency thesis, as well. Apple, for example, took the same tack as Kliebard when he wrote in an explanatory note,

> I have selected these individuals [Franklin Bobbitt, W.W. Charters, Edward L. Thorndike, Ross L. Finney, Charles S. Peters, David Snedden] as the most important formative members of the curriculum field because I believe that their identification with the social efficiency movement and a behavioristic psychology place them in the mainstream of the field. I am not including John Dewey and others identified with child-centered education and the child's needs/interest tradition. Although their ideas are interesting and important, they had little impact on either the curriculum field as it developed or for that matter on school practice.[50]

Franklin advanced the interpretation of Kliebard and Apple as well. He noted that scholars used the notion of social control to explain "the historic failure of American public schools to live up to their promise of promoting individual opportunity and building a more equal society." They found, instead, "that in truth American education was never designed to achieve egalitarian ends," but rather to maintain the existing social order.[51] Franklin applied the concept of social control to an analysis of the early curriculum field, maintaining that the task of the curriculum historian is "at the least to uncover but hopefully to overcome the field's undesirable traditions."[52] Like Apple, Franklin studied only those aspects of the curriculum field that fit the social control thesis. In these accounts, the labors of progressive curricularists are obscured. In effect, a chapter of curriculum history remains unwritten.

How can this be? Without engaging in a comprehensive historiographical analysis of the state of curriculum history, one explanation seems plausible.

Historical research is, of course, in part a product of its time. Curriculum history written during the late 1960s and 1970s perhaps reflects the disillusionment with traditional institutions that prevailed in American culture at the time. Curriculum historians seem to have inadvertently projected their dissatisfaction with contemporary developments in educational reform on their analysis of events of the past.

Curriculum historians writing in the late 1960s and 1970s often expressly tied their critique of the curriculum past to events of the curriculum present. Kliebard, for example, focused on the role of objectives as conceived by Franklin Bobbitt and later, according to Kliebard, by Ralph Tyler, and discerned similar notions in the "systems analysis approach" popular at the time of his writing.[53] In another instance, Kliebard traced the origins of bureaucracy in curriculum theory from the works of Frederick Taylor to the work of Franklin Bobbitt, W.W. Charters and David Snedden as a preface to criticism of W. James Popham's highly mechanistic system of determining behavioristic objectives popular at the time of his writing.[54] Franklin, too, revealed the deficiency of "accountability, competency-based education, and the behavioral objectives movement" during the 1970s by exposing technological models of curriculum construction advanced by Bobbitt, Charters, Peters, and Snedden.[55]

These historians aimed to use history to illuminate contemporary curriculum issues. In each of these cases, however, the bulk and brunt of the historians' criticisms were leveled at the curriculum past, not at the curriculum present. Their dissatisfaction with contemporary curriculum reform was vented on past curriculum reform. Much of this criticism was indeed valid for both present and past issues. But the preoccupation with manifestations of

technocratic social efficiency curriculum resulted in a profile of the origins of the curriculum field that exaggerated the work of one branch of the field and minimized the work of another branch. As historians drew direct connections between the 1920s and the 1970s, work of progressive curriculum professors during the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s was effectively ignored. Whatever the reasons for this unbalanced treatment of the history of the field, its effect has been to support the repudiation of the traditional curriculum field as part of the "reconceptualization" project.

The Paradigm Shift

Advocates of the "reconceptualization" invoked Kuhn's conception of paradigmatic change to explain their actions.[56] Pinar et al., for example, employed the term cautiously but effectively in their synoptic textbook of reconceptualized curriculum theory. At one point they explained that they used the term "paradigm," "in a non-specialized, non-Kuhnian, simple dictionary sense of the word" to characterize the Tyler rational as the typical mode of thinking of the "traditional field.[57] They cautiously suggested that "the curriculum field has experienced a paradigm shift similar, for example, to that undergone in the humanities during the previous two decades."[58] A few pages later, they claimed, "The use of the term paradigm seems to us not entirely unreasonable to refer to the Reconceptualization."[59] Later, however, they asserted definitively that during the 1970s "a weakened [curriculum] field would undergo the cataclysm known as 'paradigm shift,'" citing Kuhn.[60] This subtle escalation of the meaning of the term paradigm is remarkable.

Aside from the likelihood that the use of the term "paradigm" without its Kuhnian implications (that is, of bestowing scientific legitimacy on the

phenomenon so described) is by now impossible, when describing the "reconceptualization," the term is highly problematic. Pinar and associates were sensitive to the limitations of using a construct intended to explain changes in the "hard" sciences to describe events in the social sciences and the humanities, at least at the outset of their book. Brown also revealed the limitations of the term in describing changes in the curriculum field. Brown conceded that "a dramatically new formulation of the curriculum field does appear to exist, have its advocates and adherents, and manifest itself at least partially along generational lines."[61] He wondered, however, whether there existed "any real evidence that these are signs of paradigm succession rather than the proliferation of schools" of thought.[62] This, however, is only part of the problem with the paradigm thesis.

Without elaborating Kuhn's conception of paradigm shift in detail, at least one important contrast between his conception of paradigmatic change and the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field is critical. In the examples of paradigm change in the sciences that Kuhn cites (in the contributions of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Lavoisier, and Einstein, for example), while the laws, theories, applications, and even instrumentation of a particular field change dramatically and profoundly, the phenomena under study remain the same. Describing "the scientist who embraces a new paradigm," Kuhn noted, "Confronting the same constellation of objects as before and knowing that he does so, he nevertheless finds them transformed through and through in many of their details."[63] This was not exclusively the case in the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field. As reconceptualized curriculum theory conceived of curriculum expansively as not only transcending school experience, but even as encompassing virtually any aspect of the human condition, it departed from the

curriculum field not only in theoretical terms, but in terms of the phenomena to be studied. Theory was not merely brought into the curriculum field from other academic fields, but phenomena outside the field were regarded as appropriate subjects for curriculum inquiry. Reconceptualists often cast their gaze on an entirely different "constellation of objects." Reconceptualized curriculum theorists, in effect, left the curriculum field in pursuit of new subjects to study.

As partial explanations of the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field, the social efficiency interpretation of the history of the curriculum field and of the Tyler rationale, as well as Kuhn's notion of paradigmatic change, are highly problematic. The "reconceptualization" is based upon a selective account of the past that privileges the reconceptualist agenda as it defers the whole truth of the history of the curriculum field. In short, despite criticisms of the traditional field as ahistorical and express commitments to opening a dialog with the past, "reconceptualized" curriculum history has been susceptible to its own brand of historical presentism. Since the rejection of the traditional field was based upon a narrow interpretation of the origins of the curriculum field and since Kuhn's concept of paradigmatic change has limited applications to the curriculum field, key assumptions upon which the "reconceptualization" rested are not only inaccurate but also inadequate to explain the tumultuous changes in curriculum studies that occurred during the 1970s.

Toward New Understandings of the "Reconceptualization"

The "reconceptualization" is better understood as a reflection of pervading trends in contemporary American social thought, as "interesting social theory," and as an "interpersonal-affiliative phenomenon."

Reflection of Contemporary Social Thought

Most accounts of the "reconceptualization" limit consideration of context to the history of the curriculum field and its relation to educational reform, at best associating the reconceptualization with the counter-culture movement of the 1960s.[64] Brown acknowledged that external forces, such as "changed cultural values," can influence the internal dynamics of an academic field.[65] Indeed, elements of the reconceptualization reflected broad trends in American society and culture.

William H. White, for example, articulated two "dominant conditions" that prevailed in American social thought around the 1980 presidential campaign. He called these conditions "the National Humiliation" and "the Great American Inflation."[66] American pride suffered a series of international embarrassments: losing a protracted war in Southeast Asia, being held hostage figuratively by Middle Eastern oil moguls and, in 1979, literally by the fanaticism of the Iranian Revolution. The Watergate scandal, as well, deflated American pride. Inflation had been climbing since the late 1960s and in 1980 reached an astronomical 18 percent. These combined psychic and fiscal failings resulted in a profound disillusionment with traditional institutions.

In the context of these conditions, the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field can be understood in part as a manifestation of pervasive disillusionment with traditional institutions. Initially, the "reconceptualization" involved a repudiation of the traditional field. Even though the agenda of reconceptualized curriculum theory is often focused on the vitality of that theory itself, advocates still characterize the history of the movement as a revolt against the traditional field. Further, advocates tend to depict the traditional field

monolithically as preoccupied with bureaucratic prerogatives. Insofar as it repudiated the established curriculum field, to suggest that the "reconceptualization" was in part an "anti-establishment" movement is not far-fetched. Looking back on the conflict between the "traditionalists" and the "reconceptualists," a conflict often cast in generational terms, Pinar et al. noted, "Nor did we rebels--would-be revolutionaries--ask for the microphone politely."[67]

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., characterized historical cycles in the United States "as a continuing shift in national involvement, between public purpose and private interest."[68] Describing the impact of the tumultuous events of the late 1960s and early 1970s, Schlesinger suggested, "So much trauma compressed in so short a time produced national disillusion and exhaustion. . . . By the later 1970s," he continued, "Americans were once more, as they had been in the 1950s and the 1920s, fed up with public action and disenchanted by its consequences." Schlesinger concluded, "The compass needle now swung toward private interest and the fulfillment of the self."[69] During this time period, the "reconceptualization" retreated from the historic commitment of curriculum scholars to the resolution of the practical problems of public schools. While political analysis of the curriculum, emerging from the social milieu of the late 1960s, thrived under the "reconceptualization" and may be said to reflect a concern with public issues, a turn inward is clearly manifest in much reconceptualized curriculum theorizing. Personal curriculum theorizing was often exalted over engagement with developing curriculum in the public setting of the school.

The "reconceptualization" departed from commitments to the traditional field in a variety of ways. One way involved distancing curriculum theory and inquiry from school practice. Another involved conceiving of "curriculum" in the broadest possible sense, encompassing the course of ones life experience. Under this expansive conception of curriculum, virtually any phenomenon qualified as subject matter for curriculum inquiry. Curriculum studies began to focus on areas of inquiry previously associated with other fields, such as political science, philosophy, psychology, and theology. A scholar's life history became an appropriate, even necessary subject for curriculum contemplation. Personal curriculum theorizing and self-psychoanalysis emerged as accepted forms of curriculum inquiry.[70]

The legitimization of introspection and autobiographical method, coupled with the deemphasis of the resolution of practical curriculum problems as they exist in public schools, reflect the retreat from "public action" and the preoccupation with "private interest and the fulfillment of the self" that Schlesinger perceived in American social thought in the 1970s and 1980s. In fact, the public school experience was depicted as "devastating" to the self.[71] In effect, the public and private spheres were seen as incompatible and antagonistic. The public sphere was abandoned as fulfillment of the self was exalted over pursuit of the common good. At best, individual "situations" could only be improved by first fulfilling our "selves," though ultimately, we "write autobiography for ourselves," rather than for the social good.[72] Curriculum inquiry became a form of personal therapy.[73]

This emphasis on curriculum inquiry as a form of therapeutic introspection reflects aspects of "the culture of narcissism" articulated by Christopher Lasch.[74]

Like Schlesinger, Lasch observed, "After the political turmoil of the sixties, Americans have retreated to purely personal preoccupations."[75] Finding "a meaning in life" became the priority of "the new narcissist."[76] Lasch also discerned the emergence of a "cultural devaluation of the past" in American social thought of the seventies. Lasch lamented that, "We are fast losing the sense of historical continuity, the sense of belonging to a succession of generations originating in the past and stretching into the future."[77] Early representations of the "reconceptualization" as a repudiation and sharp departure from the historic field reflected the "cultural devaluation of the past" that Lasch lamented.

"Interesting Social Theory"

The "reconceptualization" can also be understood as an example of what Davis called "interesting social theory."[78] Based on his examination of dozens of famous sociological theories, Davis concluded that "an interesting proposition was one which attempted first to expose the ontological claim of its accredited counterpart as merely phenomenological pretense, and then to deny this phenomenological pretense with its own claim to ontological priority. In brief, an interesting proposition was always the negation of an accepted one."[79] A theory is interesting to a particular academic audience when "it stands out in their attention in contrast to the web of routinely taken-for-granted propositions which make up the theoretical structure of their every day life."[80] Davis emphasized that the revelation of a new truth is an unnecessary criterion for a social theory to be interesting. Simply, "a new theory will be noticed only when it denies an old truth."[81] Davis advised, "A theorist is considered great, not because his theories are true, but because they are interesting."[82]

Davis found that interesting social theories were often advanced by a technique he called "Consensus Creation." Consensus Creation involved the "rhetorical technique of integrating all of the assumptions which are to be refuted into a single (wrong) assumption of the 'other side.'"[83] Consensus Creation usually involves depicting "a few representative writers" as "saying essentially the same thing about a particular topic."[84] Such a depiction often amounts to a misrepresentation of the targeted assumptions. Once a theoretical tradition is depicted in this manner, the writer "adduces one or more propositions which deny what has been traditionally assumed." Next, the theorist proves using "various methodological devices that the old routinely assumed propositions are wrong while the new ones . . . are right." Finally, "he suggests the practical consequences of these new propositions for . . . ongoing social research, specifically how they ought to deflect onto new paths."[85]

The parallels between Davis' concepts of "Consensus Creation" and "Interesting Social Theory" and the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field are striking. Proponents of the "reconceptualization" depicted Bobbitt, Charters, and Tyler as in agreement about the ways and means of curriculum construction and presented this contrived position as representative of all curriculum work prior to the 1970s. Tyler, of course, served as the archetype of this "undesirable tradition." Opponents of this tradition then denied the belief that curriculum developers had contributed to the progressive improvement of schools as an instrument of enlightened democratic policy and practice and argued that, in truth, the opposite was the case. The notion of social control as elucidated by Franklin and other curriculum historians, Kuhn's theory of paradigmatic change, and later the postmodern critique of modernism served as

the methodological or conceptual devices that proved the accepted assumption of social progress resulting from curriculum development endeavors wrong. Finally, champions of the "reconceptualization" prescribed a subsequent agenda focused not on curriculum development, but on curriculum understanding, as a necessary palliative for the otherwise terminally "moribund" curriculum field. Although this brief sketch may oversimplify the facts of the case somewhat, the general analogy rings true.

Davis rejected Kuhn's contention that anomalies serve as the motivation behind the search for a new, revolutionary world view of a particular field of investigation. Davis contended instead "that sheer boredom with the old routinely accepted paradigm and desire to make a name for themselves would motivate many scientists to look for anomalies unexplainable by the old paradigm but explainable by a new one (preferably of their own devising)."[86]

The applicability of Davis' interesting social theory thesis to the "reconceptualization" of the curriculum field obviously has its limitations. Chief among them is the fact that few "traditionalist" curriculum scholars bought into the new line of thought. Most seemed to have ignored the new theory, only a few troubled themselves to critique it.[87] Reconceptualized theory made a more profound impression on the rising generation of curriculum scholars than on established scholars. Alone, then, Davis' "interesting social theory" thesis is provocative but inadequate to explain the reconceptualization.

An "Interpersonal-Affiliative" Phenomenon

Early in the "reconceptualization" movement, Pinar took pains to insist that the "reconceptualization, it must be noted, is fundamentally an intellectual phenomenon, not an interpersonal-affiliative one." Pinar based this disclaimer

largely on the fact that at the time reconceptualists had "no organized group, such as ASCD or AERA."[88] Yet the so-called reconceptualists held an annual conference and established a journal as forums for their views. The AERA Critical Issues in Curriculum SIG (founded in 1973 under the name Creation and Utilization of Curriculum Knowledge) also served as a forum for theoretical curriculum inquiries.[89] These facts suggest that, to a considerable extent, the "reconceptualization" can be understood an "interpersonal-affiliative" movement.

Viewed in a wider context, the "interpersonal-affiliative" aspect of reconceptualized curriculum theory raises issues of identity and institutional affiliation. Proponents of reconceptualized curriculum theory rejected scholarship of the curriculum field in favor of continental social theory, repudiated the historic and professional commitment of curriculum professors to practical problems of public schooling, and redefined "curriculum" to include virtually any phenomenon experienced by humankind as an appropriate subject for curriculum inquiry. The principal resemblance between the historic and the reconceptualized curriculum field resides simply in the continued, though strained, use of the term "curriculum." One way to grasp the profound difference between the traditional and reconceptualized approaches to the study of curriculum is to substitute the term "human condition" or "existence" for the word "curriculum" in reconceptualized discourse. Significantly, with this substitution, the substance and meaning of much reconceptualized curriculum theorizing is unchanged. Given its continuing affiliation with institutional aspects of curriculum scholarship despite its resounding repudiation of definitive

historic commitments of the field, "reconceptualized" curriculum theory is perhaps best characterized as being in the curriculum field, but not of it.

From Repudiation to Reconciliation

As adherents of reconceptualized curriculum theory increased in number over the last twenty years, especially among the rising generation of curriculum scholars, reconceptualized curriculum studies acquired prominence in academic curriculum circles. Reconceptualized curriculum theory dominates the program of Division B of AERA and annually appears more frequently on the program of the Professors of Curriculum meetings, especially those held at AERA. The publication of two textbooks in this area will certainly aid the cause of promoting the "reconceptualization." Many of the foundational assumptions of the "reconceptualization," especially the rejection of the Tyler rationale, remain in recent reconceptualized curriculum theorizing. Yet emerging signs of subtle shifts on some positions point to an apparent attempt to reconcile reconceptualized curriculum studies with the historic curriculum field.

Faint signs of reconciliation are perhaps evident in the sometimes cautious use of Kuhn's theory of paradigmatic change to characterize the "reconceptualization" and in the recognition of some "desirable" practices in progressive curriculum development, such as the necessary involvement of teachers in curriculum development and the generation of interdisciplinary patterns of curriculum organization.[90] The increasing interest in the implications of reconceptualized curriculum theory for school practice may portend reconciliation, as well, although this development is fraught with problems that stem from a failure to build upon past practice and a propensity to coopt progressive curriculum practices in the name of postmodernism.[91]

Most striking, however, is an effort by Pinar and associates to give the appearance that reconceptualized curriculum theorists actually work within important traditions of the historic field. In Understanding Curriculum, for example, after a discussion of social reconstructionism of the 1930s, we learn that "Curriculum as political text, its major theoretical antecedent being the work of Counts, constitutes a major contemporary curriculum discourse, as we shall see in chapter 5." The authors also asserted that Counts' work "foreshadowed" criticism of the Tyler rationale during the 1970s. Similarly, after discussing Margaret Naumberg's criticism of Dewey's social theory, the authors claimed, "A therapeutic notion of education would resurface in the alternative schools movement of the 1960s." And Horace Mann Bond's work on the education of African-Americans "foreshadowed the establishment in the 1990s of race as a central curriculum discourse." They associated progressive educators as a group with later work when the authors described them as "courageous and committed to the reconceptualization of American education."[92] In short, Pinar and associates seem to have made a concerted effort to depict reconceptualized curriculum theory as a part of rather than apart from the historic field.

To overstate these signs of reconciliation, unfortunately, would be a mistake. They are undermined, for example, by continuing impolite requests for the microphone, such as this mandate to include literature about curriculum understanding in courses devoted to curriculum development: "To ignore poststructuralism, for instance, is little different than censorship, little different from an old Soviet-style refusal to report world news, simply because the Party insisted on its version of what reality was."[93] More important, until reconceptualized curriculum theorists confront the historically problematic

assumptions upon which the "reconceptualization" rests, the events of the 1970s will be better understood not as a bona fide reconceptualization of a field of study, but as an "interpersonal-affiliative" movement inspired by "interesting social theory" that resonated in the prevailing sociopolitical milieu.

Notes

[1] Steven Best, The Politics of Historical Vision: Marx, Foucault, Habermas (NY: The Guilford Press, 1995), p. xii.
[2] William F. Pinar, William M. Reynolds, Patrick Slattery, and Peter M. Taubman, Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses (NY: Peter Lang, 1995), p. 157. Here Pinar et al. echo the charge Schwab leveled at the field after himself serving in a leadership role in the NSF projects. See Joseph J. Schwab, "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum," School Review (November 1969), p. 5. Other sympathetic historical accounts of the "reconceptualization" ignore wider educational contexts and focus on internal workings of emerging reconceptualized curriculum thought. See Margaret Ann Huber, "The Renewal of Curriculum Theory in the 1970s: An Historical Study," Journal of Curriculum Theorizing vol. 3, no. 1 (Winter 1981): 14-84; Barbara J. Benham, "Curriculum Theory in the 1970s: The Reconceptualist Movement," Journal of Curriculum Theorizing vol. 3, no. 1 (Winter 1981): 162-170.
[3] William F. Pinar, "Notes on the Curriculum Field: 1978," Educational Researcher vol. 7, no. 8 (1978), p. 6.
[4] William F. Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," Journal of Curriculum Studies vol. 10, no. 3 (1978), p. 207.
[5] Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, p. 189.
[6] Ibid., p. 187.
[7] William F. Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies, 1987: A Personal Retrospective," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision vol. 3, no. 2 (Winter 1988): 157-167.
[8] Pinar, "Notes on the Curriculum Field 1978," p. 9.
[9] William F. Pinar, "What is the Reconceptualization?" The Journal of Curriculum Theorizing 1 (Winter 1979), p. 97.
[10] William Pinar and Madeleine Grumet, "Theory and Practice and the Reconceptualisation of Curriculum Studies," in Rethinking Curriculum Studies, ed. Martin Lawn and Len Barlor (NY: Halsted Press, 1981), p. 31.
[11] Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 205.
[12] See also, Henry A. Giroux, "Toward a New Sociology of Curriculum," Educational Leadership vol. 37, no. 3 (December 1979): 248-253.
[13] Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies, 1987: A Personal Retrospective," p. 162.

[14] For early manifestations of this trend see William F. Pinar and Madeleine Grumet, Toward a Poor Curriculum (Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt, 1976); for recent developments see Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum.
[15] See Mary Ann Raywid, The Ax-Grinders: Critics of Our Public Schools (NY: Macmillan, 1962); Diane Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980 (NY: Basic Books, 1983); William G. Wraga, Democracy's High School: The Comprehensive High School and Educational Reform in the United States (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994).
[16] Pinar, et al., Understanding Currriculum, e.g., pp. 83, 105, 155-56.
[17] William E. Doll, Jr., A Postmodern Perspective on Curriculum (NY: Teachers College Press, 1993), passim; Patrick Slattery, Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era (NY: Garland, 1995), pp. 18, 172; Janet Miller, "Curriculum and the Reconceptualization: Another Brief History," Journal of Curriculum Theorizing vol. 12, no. 1 (Spring 1996), p. 6.
[18] Ralph W.Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949).
[19] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Reappraisal: The Tyler rationale," School Review vol. 78 (February 1970), p. 270.
[20] For example, Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 206; Pinar, "What is the Reconceptualization?" p. 96; Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies, 1987: A Personal Retrospective," p. 158.
[21] For other interpretations extant prior to the "reconceptualization," see H.L. Caswell, "Emergence of the Curriculum as a Field of Professional Work and Study," in Precedents and Promises in the Curriculum Field, ed. H.F. Robison (NY: Teachers College Press, 1968): 1-11; A.A. Bellack, "History of Curriculum Thought and Practice," Review of Educational Research 39, no. 3 (!969): 283-293.
[22] Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, p. 148. See also William F. Pinar, "Currere: Toward Reconceptualization," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists ed. William Pinar (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975), p. 397; Pinar and Grumet, "Theory and Practice and the Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies, " pp. 22-23; Doll, A Postmodern Perspective on Curriculum, pp. 52-55; Slattery, Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era, pp. 47 113.
[23] See Herbert M. Kliebard, "Reappraisal: The Tyler Rationale," School Review vol. 78 (February 1970): 259-272; Peter S. Hlebowitsh, "Amid Behavioural and Behaviouristic Objectives: Reappraising Appraisals of the Tyler Rationale," Journal of Curriculum Studies vol. 24, no. 6 (1992): 533-547; Herbert M. Kliebard, "The Tyler Rationale Revisited," Journal of Curriculum Studies vol. 27, no. 1 (1995): 81-88; Peter S. Hlebowitsh, "Interpretations of the Tyler Rationale: A Reply to Kliebard," Journal of Curriculum Studies vol. 27, no. 1 (1995): 89-94.
[24] Hlebowitsh, "Amid Behavioural and Behaviouristic Objectives," pp. 535, 547.
[25] Kliebard, "The Tyler Rationale Revisited," p. 83.
[26] Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, p. 128.
[27] Ibid., p. 55; see also p. 56.
[28] Tyler, p. 123, 122.
[29] John Dewey, The Sources of a Science of Education (NY: Horace Liveright, 1929).

[30] Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, p. 151.
[31] Ibid., p. 149.
[32] Ralph W. Tyler, William Schubert, and Ann Lynn Lopez Schubert, "A Dialogue with Ralph Tyler," Journal of Thought vol. 21, no. 1 (Spring 1986), p. 94.
[33] Jon Snyder, Frances Bolin, and Karen Zumwalt, "Curriculum Implementation," in Philip W. Jackson, ed. Handbook of Research on Curriculum (NY: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 402-435; see also Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, p. 702.
[34] Slattery, Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era, p. 113; Doll, A Postmodern Perspective on Curriculum, ch. 2.
[35] Herbert M. Kliebard, "The Curriculum Field in Retrospect," in Technology and the Curriculum ed. Paul Witt (NY: Teachers College Press, 1968), p. 71; Herbert M. Kliebard, "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists ed. William Pinar (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975), p. 39.
[36] Kliebard, "The Curriculum Field in Retrospect," p. 71.
[37] See also Doll, A Postmodern Perspective on Curriculum, p. 51.
[38] Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964), p. 384.
[39] See Arthur G. Powell, The Uncertain Profession (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1980), p. 113; Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1995), pp. 232-34, 412-13; William G. Wraga, The Comprehensive High School Revisited: Issues of Development and Dissemination (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, New York, NY, April 7, 1996).
[40] Katherine C. Mayhew and Anna C. Edwards, The Dewey School: The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, 1896-1903 (NY: Atherton Press, 1966) Originally published in 1936; Laurel N. Tanner, "The Meaning of Curriculum in Dewey's Laboratory School (1896-1904)," Journal of Curriculum Studies vol. 23, no. 2 (1991): 101-117; J.L. Meriam, Child Life and the Curriculum (Yonkers-on-Hudson, NY: World Book Company, 1920; F.G. Bonser, Elementary School Curriculum (NY: Macmillan, 1920).
[41] Herbert M. Kliebard, The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958 (Boston: Routledge Keegan Paul, 1986), p. 182. In fact, Kliebard reported that in his supplementary statement Bobbitt repudiated a central tenet of his earlier position.
[42] Raymond E. Callahan and H. Warren Button, "Historical Change of the Role of the Man in the Organization: 1865-1950," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration ed. Daniel E. Griffiths 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 90.
[43] Edward Pajak, "Change and Continuity in Supervision and Leadership," in Challenges and Achievements in American Education ed. Gordon Cawelti (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1993), p. 165. For another perspective on the founding of ASCD, see O.L. Davis, Jr., "Symbol of a Shift from Status to Function: Formation of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development," Educational Leadership vol. 35, no. 8 (May 1978): 609-614.
[44] Bonser, Child Life and the Curriculum, pp. 426 and 427, respectively.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[45] Guy M. Whipple, ed., The Foundations and Technique of Curriculum-Construction (26th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Curriculum, Part II Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company, 1926), pp. 23-24.
[46] H.L. Caswell and D.S. Campbell, Curriculum Development (NY: American Book Co., 1935), p. 468.
[47] L. Thomas Hopkins, Interaction: The Democratic Process (1941), p. 336. See L. Thomas Hopkins, Curriculum Principles and Practices (NY: Benjamin H. Sanbron, 1929), p. iii. for Hopkins' acknowledgment of his debt to Inglis.
[48] For other examples of advocacy for democratic forms of curriculum making, see J.H. Newlon, "The Need of a Scientific Curriculum Policy for Junior and Senior High Schools, Educational Administration and Supervision 3 (May 1917): 253-68; F. G. Bonser, "Implications for Elementary Education from Experiments in Democratizing Industry," Teachers College Record 21, no. 1 (January 1920): 108-116; A.L. Threkeld, "Curriculum Revision: How a Particular City May Attack the Problem," Elementary School Journal 25 (April 1925): 573-582; J. Dewey, "Democracy and Educational Administration," in John Dewey: The Latter Works, Vol. 11 ed. J.A. Boydston (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991), pp. 217-225 (Originally published in 1937).
[49] The quote is from William Pinar and Madeleine Grumet, "Theory and Practice and the Reconceptualisation of Curriculum Studies," p. 21. See also William H. Schubert, Curriculum Books (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1981); O.L. Davis, Jr., The Theoretic Meets the Practical: The Practical Wins, (Paper presented at the Oslo Curriculum Conference, August 1995).
[50] Michael W. Apple, Ideology and Curriculum 2nd. ed. (NY: Routledge, 1990), p. 179. First published in 1979.
[51] Barry M. Franklin, Building the American Community: The School Curriculum and the Search for Social Control (Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1986), p. 1.
[52] Barry M. Franklin, "Curriculum History: Its Nature and Boundaries (An Essay Review of the 1976 Yearbook of the ASCD)," Curriculum Inquiry vol. 7 (1977), p. 70; see also the Yearbook editor's reply: O.L. Davis, Jr., "The Nature and Boundaries of Curriculum History: A Contribution to Dialogue Over a Yearbook and Its Review," Curriculum Inquiry vol. 7 (1977): 157-168.
[53] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists ed. William Pinar (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975), pp. 39-50.
[54] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists ed. William Pinar (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975), pp. 74-93.
[55] Barry M. Franklin, "Technological Models and the Curriculum Field," The Educational Forum vol. 70 (March 1976), p. 304.
[56] Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions 2nd. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).
[57] Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, p. 20.
[58] Ibid., p. 12.
[59] Ibid., p. 15.
[60] Ibid., p. 159.

[61] Theodore M. Brown, "How Fields Change: A Critique of the 'Kuhnian' View," Journal Of Curriculum Theorizing vol. 3, no. 1 (Winter 1981), p. 10.
[62] Ibid., p. 12.
[63] Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, p. 122.
[64] Tanner and Tanner, Curriculum Development, pp. 325-26; Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, p. 187.
[65] Brown, "How Fields Change," p. 6; Kuhn made a similar point; see Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, p. x.
[66] William H. White, America in Search of Itself (NY: Harper & Row, 1982), p. 21.
[67] Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, p. 857.
[68] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Cycles of American History (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986), p. 27.
[69] Ibid., p. 32.
[70] Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing; William F. Pinar, "'Whole, Bright, Deep with Understanding': Issues in Qualitative Research and Autobiographical Method," in Recent Developments in Curriculum Studies ed. Philip H. Taylor (NFER-NELSON, 1986), pp. 16-40.
[71] See William Pinar, "Sanity, Madness, and the School," in Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists ed. William Pinar (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975), p. 381.
[72] Pinar, "'Whole, Bright, Deep with Understanding,'" pp. 33, 34.
[73] Pinar and Grumet, Toward a Poor Curriculum; William F. Pinar, Autobiography, Politics, and Sexuality: Essays in Curriculum Theory, 1972-1992 (NY: Peter Lang, 1994).
[74] Christopher Lasch, The Culture of Narcissism (NY: Warner Books, 1979).
[75] Ibid., p. 29.
[76] Ibid., p. 22.
[77] Ibid., p. 30.
[78] Murray S. Davis, "That's Interesting! Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology," Philosophy of the Social Sciences vol. 1 (1971): 309-344.
[79] Ibid., p. 313.
[80] Ibid., p. 311.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid., p. 309.
[83] Ibid., p. 332.
[84] Ibid., p. 333.
[85] All Ibid., p. 312. The technique of "Consensus Creation" has parallels in the following formula that Turner detected in postmodern art: "first, the subversion of the traditional means of representation, which are held to serve the interests of the power elite; next, what poststructuralist critics call 'the play of signifiers,' designed to undermine the expectations of the public; finally, the reminder that the sucker who buys the thing is complicit in the fraud described by the fashion magazines as the late capitalist commodification of desire." See Frederick Turner, "The Freedoms of the Past," Harper's Magazine vol. 290, no. 1739 (April 1995), p. 59.
[86] Ibid., p. 343, emphasis in the original.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[87] See Daniel Tanner and Laurel N. Tanner, "Emancipation from Research: The Reconceptualist Prescription," Educational Researcher vol. 8, no. 6 (June 1979): 8-12, and relatedly Yvonna S. Lincoln, "Curriculum Studies and the Traditions of Inquiry: The Humanistic Tradition" in Handbook of Research on Curriculum ed. Philip W. Jackson (NY: Macmillan, 1992), p. 85; W.A. Reid, "The State of Curriculum Inquiry," Journal of Curriculum Studies 24, no. 2 (1992): 165-177; P.S. Hlebowitsh, Radical Curriculum Theory Reconsidered: A Historical Approach (NY: Teachers College Press, 1993). For a scathing critique of a similar arrogation of the field of American studies that, by implication, offers insights into developments in the curriculum field, see Steven Watts, "The Idiocy of American Studies: Poststructuralism, Language, and Politics in the Age of Self-Fulfillment," American Quarterly, 43, no. 4 (December 1991): 625-660.

[88] Pinar, "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," p. 211.

[89] Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, pp. 218-19, 219, 201.

[90] Ibid., pp. 20, 83, 105, 155-56.

[91] Slattery, Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era, pp. 9, 31, 96, 97.

[92] Pinar, et al., Understanding Curriculum, pp. 121, 127, 126, 128, and 129, respectively.

[93] Ibid., p. 9.